

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

The specification is objected to.

Claims 1-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,782,402 to Hidaka et al. ("Hidaka").

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidaka in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,378 to Meyer et al. ("Meyer").

The Information Disclosure Statement filed on May 31, 2001 is allegedly non-compliant.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has canceled claims 1-17 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant has added new claims 18-34.

Claims 18-34 are pending.

Applicant submits herewith English language abstracts of the two Japanese references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on May 31, 2001.

Matters of Form

The Office Action alleges that the Information Disclosure Statement ("IDS") filed on May 31, 2001 is allegedly non-compliant because no English language translation was filed for the two Japanese references cited therein. Applicant respectfully submits that the IDS is in full compliance with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.97 and 1.98 in that the IDS specifically indicates that the relevance of the two Japanese references cited therein is described at page 1 of the instant

English language specification. *See* 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(3)(i) and MPEP § 609. Nonetheless Applicant submits herewith English language abstracts of the two Japanese references for the convenience of the Examiner.

The Office Action indicates that the specification is objected to because “the status of related application no. 09/954,299 needs to be updated.” It is submitted that the instant specification does not reference application no. 09/954,299 anywhere. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hidaka. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidaka in view of Meyer. Applicant has canceled claims 1-17 without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), moot.

Applicant has added new claims 18-34. Support for new claims 18-34 is provided at, for example, page 5, line 21 – page 6, line 15, and Figs. 1-2 of Applicant’s specification. Applicant submits that new claims 18-34 are patentable over Hidaka and Meyer. For example, claim 18 recites a system for reading an image, including an image reader, a display operation part, and a management device. The image reader includes an operation instruction receiving part, and a reading part. The display operation part displays information and receives an operation instruction from a user, the management device, or the image reader. The management device manages the image reader and the display operation part. The management device, the image reader and the display operation part are connected over a network, and the reading part reads the

image based on an operation instruction received by the operation instruction receiving part and/or an operation instruction received by the display operation part.

Thus the invention provides, for example, that a management server 1, such as a Web server, transfers an operation instruction to an instruction unit 32 of a scanner 2. An image-reading unit 23 of the scanner 2 reads a document to produce image data, based on the operation instruction of the management server 1. A display unit 31 of the scanner 2 may operate as the Web browser, and acquire a Web page from the management server 1. With this configuration, the system is able to share an operation instruction screen (user interface) displayed on the display unit 31 with a plurality of scanners 2-1 through 2-n, and to provide operation instructions to the plurality of scanners via the management server 1. Support for these features is provided at, for example, page 5, line 21 – page 6, line 15, and Figs. 1-2 of Applicant's specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Hidaka nor Meyer teach or suggest at least the features of a display operation part that receives an operation instruction from a user, a management device, or an image reader, as recited in claim 18. Claims 19-32 ultimately depend from claim 18 and recite the same combination of allowable features as well as additional features that define over the applied art. For example, claim 2 recites the display operation part is shared with a plurality of scanners. Claim 15 recites the display operation part includes a display screen and the screen is shared with a plurality of scanners per a division.

Examination of new claims 18-34 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.


If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: November 16, 2004

By:


Peter J. Sistare
Registration No. 48,183

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202.739.3000